



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, DC 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/784,224	01/16/97	SULLIVAN	A 128-96-003

LM32/0908

L JOY GRIEBENOW  
ELECTRONIC DATA SYSTEMS CORPORATION  
5400 LEGACY DRIVE  
H3-3A-05  
PLANO TX 75024

EXAMINER

MYHRE, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2765

6

DATE MAILED:

09/08/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/784,224**

Applicant(s)  
**Sullivan**

Examiner  
**James Myhre**

Group Art Unit  
**2765**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James Myhre

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Barton E. Showalter

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Sep 2, 1998

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4, and 5

Identification of prior art discussed:

Oku (5,675,745) and Chang (5,263,126)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's representative identified the novelty of the invention as disclosed in Claims 1, 4, and 5 as being the make up and interconnections of the database components, namely the knowledge matrix in which a knowledge item consists of a step of a process and an instance of a data item and their relationship. Applicant's representative further pointed out that the process cycle grid and the data cycle grid contained status information pertaining to the need. Examiner suggested an additional amendment be submitted which further clarified the novelty of the invention. Applicant's representative agreed and asked that the finality of the application be withdrawn to ensure the new amendment be given due consideration. Examiner said that he would consult his supervisor in reference to withdrawing the finality.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.